Psychotherapy and Politics International

2022, VOL. *20*, NO. 3, 1–23
https://doi.org/10.24135/ppi.v20i3.08

Online ISSN: 1556-9195 Journal homepage: https://ojs.aut.ac.nz/psychotherapy-politics-international

PEER-REVIEWED ARTICLE

Beyond Agamben's '*Homo Sacer*'—The 'pandemic' as final reduction of humanity to 'bare life'

Bert Olivier,* Department of Philosophy, University of the Free State, South Africa

ABSTRACT

The current 'pandemic' is approached through the lens of (mainly) the concept of *Homo sacer*, elaborated on by Giorgio Agamben (1998). Taking the work of Michel Foucault on the 'disciplinary society' and 'bio-politics' further, and drawing on the role played by the principle of *homo sacer* in antiquity, Agamben uncovers the disconcerting extent to which this principle has become generalised in contemporary societies. In antiquity, the principle of 'sacred man/human' was invoked in cases where someone was exempted from ritual sacrifice, but simultaneously seen as 'bare life', and therefore as being fit for execution. Agamben argues that the sphere of 'sacred life' has grown immensely since ancient times in so far as the modern state arrogates to itself the right to wield biopolitical power over 'bare life' in a manner analogous to ancient practices, and finds in the concentration camp the contemporary paradigm of this phenomenon. Arguing that today we witness a further downward step in the treatment of humans as 'bare life', these concepts are employed as a heuristic for bringing into focus current practices under the aegis of the COVID-19 'pandemic'. In particular, here the spotlight falls on those areas where burgeoning 'bare life' practices can be detected, namely 'origin of the virus' and 'lethal vaccines'. In an upcoming second article, other aspects are addressed, as well as the question of commensurate psychotherapy.

KEYWORDS: Agamben; bare life; *homo sacer*; pandemic; vaccines

*Contact details: OlivierG1@ufs.ac.za

> And also for the sake of mere life (in which there is possibly some noble element so long as the evils of existence do not greatly overbalance the good) mankind meet together and maintain the political community. And we all see that men cling to life even at the cost of enduring great misfortune, seeming to find in life a natural sweetness and happiness (Aristotle, *Politics*, p. 2866).
>
> The sovereign sphere is the sphere in which it is permitted to kill without committing homicide and without celebrating a sacrifice, and sacred life—that is, life that may be killed but not sacrificed—is the life that has been captured in this sphere (Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, p. 53).

INTRODUCTION: THE PRESENT AS DEGRADED

Whatever one may think of the present (mid-2022) state of the world, most people would agree that everywhere something seems seriously wrong. Whether it is the inescapable awareness of being caught in the throes of a 'pandemic'—put in scare quotes here because it is arguably *not* a pandemic (for an elaboration, see Olivier, 2021a, 2021b)—together with all the suffocating emergency measures that governments all over the world (with few exceptions) have taken, supposedly to safeguard citizens against a deadly pathogen, or the equally unavoidable consciousness of a global economic situation that seems to deteriorate by the day, things do not seem rosy for the immediate future, while the distant future fades into unpredictability. In a word, the present is, as most people would probably agree, degraded, albeit for reasons that would probably be articulated differently from one person to the next. Hence, while there may be agreement about this state of the present world, the question arises: what perspectives, or 'theoretical lenses', lend themselves to scrutinising the present in a manner that optimises the intelligibility of the current global state of affairs? Previously, I have resorted to three different theoretical perspectives in an attempt to attain this goal of comprehensibility—Lyotard's notion of the *differend* (Olivier, 2021a), the (psychoanalytical) concept of (mass) psychosis (Olivier, 2022b), and Derrida's paradoxical understanding of (mis)communication (Olivier, 2022a). Here, I turn chiefly to Giorgio Agamben's concept of *homo sacer*, in so far as it lends itself to clarifying what is at stake today regarding the consequences of the 'pandemic' and the 'medical' measures taken, putatively to ameliorate its effects. As I shall demonstrate, these measures have constituted the terrain of the social in its entirety as that of *homo sacer*, in the process reducing citizens to 'bare life', with the current iatrarchy (rule of physicians)—or alternatively, pharmocracy—exercising an unheard of form of sovereign power by taking biopolitical rule to the next level, that of 'necropolitics' (Mbembe, 2003), or the politics of death.

I should note that I am not here primarily concerned with entering into a debate with Agamben's critics regarding his comments on various aspects of the 'pandemic' since its commencement. As the representative example of Benjamin Bratton's critical commentary (which provides a useful, if biased, summary of Agamben's various 'pandemic'-related

comments; 2021) shows—in light of what I argue below—such rejection of Agamben's position arguably and demonstrably rests on two wrong premises. The first is that the novel coronavirus was of natural zoonotic (and not laboratory) origin, and that humankind therefore has to reorient itself in an in-principle permanently 'pandemic' world, and the second is that medical science is committed to finding ways to ensure the health of humanity. These, as I demonstrate below, are both seriously mistaken, and issue from a failure to examine the pertinent evidence. These erroneous assumptions are clearly reflected in the excerpt from his own recent book with which Bratton concludes his article (2021):

> A *laissez-faire* vitalism for which 'life will find a way' is not an option; it is a fairy tale of a comfortable class who don't live with the daily agency of sewage landscapes and exposed corpses… Instead, (This positive) biopolitics is inclusive, materialist, restorative, rationalist, based on a demystified image of the human species, anticipating a future different from the one prescribed by many cultural traditions. It accepts the evolutionary entanglement of mammals and viruses. It accepts death as part of life. It therefore accepts the responsibilities of medical knowledge to prevent and mitigate unjust deaths and misery as something quite different from the nativist immunization of one population of people from another. (para. 23)

Just how naïve this admittedly well-formulated (albeit misguided) position is in its assumption of particularly a (by implication) responsible medical science (or scientists), will, I hope, become apparent in the light of evidence to the contrary, which is adduced below. There was a reason for the formulation of the Hippocratic oath: it is one thing to possess medical knowledge or skills; it is quite another to use them consistently for the benefit of patients.

AGAMBEN, *HOMO SACER*, AND 'BARE LIFE'

Readers of Michel Foucault (1988, 1992) will know that when he turned to Greek and (especially) Roman antiquity in his genealogical investigation of human sexuality, he found there admirable personal ethical practices, conducive to a high degree of moral and existential autonomy under the rubric of 'the care of the self'. In Foucault's earlier genealogical studies, however, the picture that emerged of the modern world in *Discipline and Punish*, as well as in Volume I of *The History of Sexuality*, was indeed bleak. In the former work, on the history of historically changing modes of punishment—where the cruel and spectacular public punitive practices of pre-modernity are contrasted with the 'gentler' (but more effective) punishments of modernity—Foucault (1995) uncovered a carceral or prison-like world (ours) in which individuals are reduced to 'docile bodies' through various disciplinary techniques such as 'hierarchical observation', 'normalising judgement', and the 'examination' (see Olivier, 2010 for an elaboration on this). In the first volume on sexuality, Foucault (1980) amplified this austere social landscape by detailing the inescapable hold that 'bio-power' has on individuals and populations through strategies of what he called the

'anatomo-politics of the body' (for example, the pedagogical control of children's sex, and the social control of reproduction) and the 'bio-politics of populations' (for example, population control). Achille Mbembe (2003) has taken Foucault's work further by arguing that, given certain socio-political phenomena in the contemporary world—specifically the treatment of Palestinians by Israel—one can justifiably refer to 'necropolitics' instead of bio-politics. As demonstrated below, the present article's focus on Agamben's concept of *homo sacer* as an interpretive lens for the present state of the world resonates with Mbembe's notion of 'necropolitics'.

Confirming Foucault's diagnosis of 'modern societies of control' (a phrase used by Gilles Deleuze, 1992), Giorgio Agamben (in the *Introduction* to *Homo Sacer*, 1998) remarked that the development of capitalism, in particular, would not have been possible without the 'disciplinary control' achieved by the advent of bio-power, which was responsible for the creation of the requisite 'docile bodies' by means of a range of appropriate technologies, alluded to above. This was implicitly recognised by Foucault (1995), where he writes of disciplinary techniques producing bodies that are politically 'docile', but economically 'productive'. Not content to leave Foucault's work at that, Agamben has gone further along a similar path of investigation, and published an even more sobering, appalling, or shocking (all of which are understatements) account of modern society than Foucault's—one that unmasks it by means of the heuristic of the paradoxical (and puzzling) determination, in Roman law, that someone condemned to death was 'sacred' and could not be sacrificed, although such a person, having been reduced to 'bare life' in the 'sovereign' realm, could be killed or executed. Agamben writes about

> …a limit sphere of human action that is only ever maintained in a relation of exception. This sphere is that of the sovereign decision, which suspends law in the state of exception and thus implicates bare life within it. We must therefore ask ourselves if the structure of sovereignty and the structure of *sacratio* might be connected, and if they might, from this perspective, be shown to illuminate each other. We may even then advance a hypothesis: once brought back to his proper place beyond both penal law and sacrifice, *homo sacer* presents the originary figure of life taken into the sovereign ban and preserves the memory of the originary exclusion through which the political dimension was first constituted. The political sphere of sovereignty was thus constituted through a double exclusion, as an excrescence of the profane in the religious and of the religious in the profane, which takes the form of a zone of indistinction between sacrifice and homicide. *The sovereign sphere is the sphere in which it is permitted to kill without committing homicide and without celebrating a sacrifice, and sacred life—that is, life that may be killed but not sacrificed—is the life that has been captured in this sphere.* (1998, p. 53; italics in original)

The meaning of 'sacrifice' in the context of religious ritual is all-important here, and can easily be overlooked—if a 'sacred' person could be killed but not sacrificed, it means, firstly, that the epithet 'sacred' has to be attached to someone to be able to justify, ironically, their exclusion from religious ritual sacrifice (which would presumably conflict with the reasons for

that person's death sentence; hence the supposed 'sacredness' precludes participation in the ritual). In other words, it is merely a ruse to justify treating them as 'bare life', which may then be terminated by execution—something that enacted itself on an unprecedented scale in what is known as the Holocaust, with Hitler ordering the extermination of Jews 'as lice' (Agamben, 1998). *Homo sacer* therefore suggests, paradoxically, that a person is 'sacred' in the sense that they belong to the gods or God, who can decide on their fate. Roughly, therefore, it seems to correspond to the English (American) notion of 'outlawed' or 'outlaw' ('outside the law'), and the German *vogelfrei* ('free as a bird'; 'voëlvry' in Afrikaans).

What motivated Agamben's research into the link between 'sacred human', 'bare life', and 'sovereignty' can only be briefly reconstructed here, although its comprehension is crucial to grasping why I am focusing on it in relation to what is arguably a radical contemporary transformation, or perhaps rather extension—which was always, potentially, implicit in the social and political order—of the terrain in which this relationship and its exacerbation are located. Regarding this terrain—the political—it may seem strange that Agamben, following Aristotle, establishes a connection between language and its emergence. He (Agamben, 1998) quotes Aristotle from *Politics* where the latter distinguishes between humans and other animals with reference to 'voice' (*phoné*) and 'language' (*logos*), and ties the latter to 'dwelling and the city [*polis*]' (p. 12). Only humans have language, through which the 'just' and the 'unjust' are articulated, as opposed to other living beings that possess 'voice' as means to express pleasure or pain. Hence, *logos*, or intelligible language, as a crucial constituent of the political, differentiates between *zoē* ('bare life', shared by all living beings) and *bios* (a specific mode of life, such as the political)—something that corresponds with Hannah Arendt's (1998; see also Olivier, 2018) claim, that it is in 'action' (the *verbal* participation in politics) that the highest manifestation of being human is manifested. As was already indicated earlier, this does not mean that human beings do not participate in *zoē* in society, albeit in a paradoxical, exclusive manner. In fact, Agamben (1998) points out that: 'In Western politics, bare life has the peculiar privilege of being that whose exclusion founds the city of men' (p. 12). 'Bare life' (*zoē*) is excluded or surpassed, first, by humans enjoying life as linguistic, 'bio-logical' beings, and yet, paradoxically, it is this very faculty that lies at the basis, second, of the exclusion of (some) human beings *from society within society*. Agamben (1998) continues:

> The question 'In what way does the living being have language?' corresponds exactly to the question 'In what way does bare life dwell in the *polis*?' The living being has *logos* by taking away and conserving its own voice in it, even as it dwells in the *polis* by letting its own bare life be excluded, as an exception, within it. Politics therefore appears as the truly fundamental structure of Western metaphysics insofar as it occupies the threshold on which the relation between the living being and the *logos* is realised. In the 'politicization' of bare life—the metaphysical *task par excellence*—the humanity of living man is decided. In assuming this task, modernity does nothing other than declare its own faithfulness to the essential structure of the metaphysical tradition. The fundamental categorial pair of Western politics is not that of

> friend/enemy but that of bare life/political existence, *zoē/bios*, exclusion/inclusion. There is politics because man is the living being who, in language, separates and opposes himself to his own bare life and, at the same time, maintains himself in relation to that bare life in an inclusive exclusion. (p. 12)

It is this 'inclusive exclusion' that interests Agamben in so far as he perceives in it the foundation of modern politics, as well as the conceptual apparatus by which Foucault's thesis concerning modern 'bio-politics' should be augmented. Furthermore, he demonstrates that this augmentation leads one to recognise that, while Foucault's perceptive insight into the modern state's preoccupation with life itself as the object of its machinations and cratological interventions is unquestionably accurate, the domain of *homo sacer*—which started out as being ambiguously located on the border between the religious and the political—has increasingly expanded, so that 'the exception everywhere becomes the rule' (Agamben, 1998, p. 12). What does this mean? That is, what is the 'state of exception', and what does its 'expansion' entail? This 'state of exception'—by which bare life as *homo sacer* is excluded from both the religious and the political domain (while simultaneously being seized within the latter as object of execution, albeit not of murder)—entails, according to Agamben, the very underpinning of the political system in its entirety. The state of exception is at the heart of the political, and in the modern democratic dispensation it pertains to human beings no longer merely as 'object', but also as 'subject' of power. With this insight, Agamben has cast Foucault's thesis concerning the bio-politics of the modern state in a significant new light: today one can no longer consider the bio-political without factoring in 'bare life' as being constitutive of the 'new biopolitical body of humanity' (Agamben, 1998, p. 13).

One of the most disconcerting things about Agamben's thesis is his claim, that—although its self-conception amounts to a freeing and justification of *zoē* (bare life), even as it attempts to change it into *bios* as a 'way of life'—modern democracy cannot escape its defining aporia, namely, to activate modern citizens' freedom in the very space of their subjugation, that of 'bare life'. Modern humans, like their ancient counterparts, may not be sacrificed, but may be killed. As he sees it, this aporia sustains both the developments that resulted in the 'democratic' recognition of human rights *and* the emergence of fascism or totalitarianism (Agamben, 1998, p. 13). He continues:

> To become conscious of this aporia is not to belittle the conquests and accomplishments of democracy. It is, rather, to try to understand once and for all why democracy, at the very moment in which it seemed to have finally triumphed over its adversaries and reached its greatest height, proved itself incapable of saving *zoē*, to whose happiness it had dedicated all its efforts, from unprecedented ruin. Modern democracy's decadence and gradual convergence with totalitarian states in post-democratic spectacular societies…may well be rooted in this aporia, which marks the beginning of modern democracy and forces it into complicity with its most implacable enemy. Today politics knows no value (and, consequently, no nonvalue) other than life, and until the contradictions that this fact implies are dissolved, Nazism and fascism –

> which transformed the decision on bare life into the supreme political principle – will remain stubbornly with us. (p. 13)

Several things strike one in this excerpt, particularly Agamben's claim that modern democracy, despite having attempted to save *zoē*—the particulars of which are also to be seen in what Michel Foucault (1980) uncovered in his work—increasingly tended towards totalitarianism in 'societies of the spectacle' (as Guy Debord labelled them in *Society of the Spectacle* [n.d.]). That his diagnosis is not far-fetched by any means has been confirmed by both Bernard Stiegler (2016) and Shoshana Zuboff (2019; see also Olivier 2019), who drew attention to particularly the technical means of surveillance and control that function in contemporary societies, and which tend towards totalitarian (or what Zuboff calls 'instrumentarian') control. Furthermore, Agamben's observation that, at present, politics is fixated on 'life' as the only 'value' and (I would claim today particularly) 'nonvalue', and that fascism is bound to persist until the lingering contradictions regarding 'bare life' are dissolved, has demonstrably taken a turn for the worse under prevailing circumstances, as I show below. Just how close the (largely 'democratic') world has come to all-pervasive totalitarianism of a certain, namely medical kind, emerges from Agamben's remarks made soon after the 'pandemic' emerged in Italy:

> Fear is a poor advisor, but it causes many things to appear that one pretended not to see. The problem is not to give opinions on the gravity of the disease, but to ask about the ethical and political consequences of the epidemic. The first thing that the wave of panic that has paralyzed the country obviously shows is that our society no longer believes in anything but bare life…
>
> The other thing, no less disquieting than the first, that the epidemic has caused to appear with clarity is that the state of exception, to which governments have habituated us for some time, has truly become the normal condition. There have been more serious epidemics in the past, but no one ever thought for that reason to declare a state of emergency like the current one, which prevents us even from moving. People have been so habituated to live in conditions of perennial crisis and perennial emergency that they don't seem to notice that their life has been reduced to a purely biological condition… (Agamben, 2020, paras. 1–2)

Having alerted his readers to the graphic manifestations of humanity being reduced to the exclusively biological condition of 'bare life' under 'pandemic' conditions, Agamben (2020) observes with great prescience:

> What is worrisome is not so much or not only the present, but what comes after. Just as wars have left as a legacy to peace a series of inauspicious technologies, from barbed wire to nuclear power plants, so it is also very likely that one will seek to continue even after the health emergency experiments that governments did not manage to bring to reality before: closing universities and schools and doing lessons only online, putting a stop once and for all to meeting together and speaking for political or cultural reasons and exchanging only digital messages with each other, wherever possible substituting machines for every contact—every contagion—between human beings. (para. 4)

These words on Agamben's part mean nothing less than the prospect of the loss of a society worthy of the epithet *human*, should the spectre of a 'non-society' without concrete, embodied inter-human social contact ever be actualised (and indications are that those promoting such a state of affairs are dead earnest about reaching their goal, as I indicate below).

THE CONCENTRATION CAMP AS 'BIOPOLITICAL PARADIGM' OF MODERNITY

Before the advent of the so-called 'pandemic', which may prove to be the optimally generalised 'state of exception'—the *ne plus ultra* of treating the large majority of humanity as being nothing more than bare life in the sense of *zoē*—the nadir of this condition was reached with the phenomenon of the 'concentration camp' (those for Jews in Nazi Germany and adjacent countries, but also others), according to Agamben (1998). The details of the developments that culminated in the concentration camp cannot all be reconstructed here, but their lowest point, as Agamben understands things, bears scrutiny for the purposes of the present article.

According to Agamben (1998), the concentration camp exemplifies the practice of denuding individuals of what the ancient Greeks thought of as human *bios*, or the distinctively human, political way of life, leaving only their 'bare, unqualified life' or what the Greeks called *zoē*. As he puts it: 'Today it is not the city but rather the camp that is the fundamental biopolitical paradigm of the West' (1998, p. 102). This has paved the way for virtually unthinkable atrocities, minus what one might expect to be accountability, regarding what remained of human individuals, namely denuded bodies, or 'bare life'—mere living beings. Recall the skeletal creatures discovered in German concentration camps at the end of WWII. This historical development formed the basis for the now widespread practice of paradoxically exercising the power of the law outside of the law. Agamben argues that the space of the (concentration) camp becomes pervasive when the 'state of exception' becomes the rule, rather than the exception. Through a scrupulous analysis of the events in Hitler's Germany that culminated in the decision, to construct a 'concentration camp for political prisoners' (as cited in Agamben, 1998, p. 96) at Dachau in 1933, he arrives at the insight, that:

> *The camp is the space that is opened when the state of exception begins to become the rule*. In the camp, the state of exception, which was essentially a temporary suspension of the rule of law on the basis of a factual state of danger, is now given a permanent spatial arrangement, which as such nevertheless remains outside the normal order. (Agamben, 1998, p. 96)

Agamben (1998) discusses instances of biopolitical intervention ranging from the 'case' of Karen Quinlan—whose body, kept functional by machines, had become 'pure *zoē*'—to what he calls (paradoxical) 'military interventions on humanitarian grounds' (p. 104), but the list far exceeds his examples. In South Africa 'Marikana'—or the infamous Marikana massacre of August 16, 2012 (Duncan, 2013)—would seem to me to qualify as one of these 'uncertain and

nameless terrains' (Agamben, 1998, p. 104), where the indefinite prolongation of mere, 'bare life' (Quinlan), or brute killing, can happen without legal consequence, because the victims have already been excluded from the domain of the law. These are just some of the manifestations of the hidden 'biopolitical paradigm of the modern'—the (concentration) camp, where one is reduced to 'bare life'.

In the interpretive analyses (below) of contemporary instances of what was earlier referred to as the *ne plus ultra* of reducing human beings to bare life, one has to keep Agamben's portentous words in mind where he writes:

> The 'body' is always already a biopolitical body and bare life, and nothing in it or the economy of its pleasure seems to allow us to find solid ground on which to oppose the demands of sovereign power. In its extreme form, the biopolitical body of the West (this last incarnation of *homo sacer*) appears as a threshold of absolute indistinction between law and fact, juridical rule and biological life. (1998, p. 105)

That 'bare life' is peculiarly relevant to the COVID-19 'pandemic' should be apparent from Agamben's analysis in *Homo Sacer* (1998), as well as his remarks (2020), quoted earlier, to the effect that in the early phase of the 'pandemic' in Italy it was obvious '…that our society no longer believes in anything but bare life' (para. 1). In what follows, what he termed the 'ethical and political consequences' (Agamben, 2020) of the 'pandemic' (and human responses to its various manifestations) will function as implicit guidelines regarding the relevance of events.

INTERLUDE: KRISTEVA AND RANCIÈRE

In passing, one should note that both Julia Kristeva and Jacques Rancière have, like Agamben, drawn attention to modes of 'exclusion', which cast light on his notion of *homo sacer*. There is a psychoanalytical sense of exclusion in Kristeva, which resonates with what is elaborated on below, namely instances of 'bare life'—treatment of people under current circumstances—the notion of 'abjection', or the 'abject'. A brief clarification will have to do here.

Freud and Lacan both noted that the infant as 'oceanic subject' does not initially distinguish between itself and its immediate surroundings (McAfee, 2004; Olivier, 2007). This is related to what Kristeva (1997) terms the semiotic *chora*, connected with the mother's body. The *chora* is the generative, quasi-spatial matrix which, as a 'totality', comprises the infant's drives (as energy-impulses and their psychic correlates). To make the infant's eventual separation from the safety provided by the *chora* of the mother's body intelligible, Kristeva posits the process of 'abjection', which here means more or less the same as 'rejection' of its erstwhile safe space, as a prerequisite for the infant subject's assumption of its 'identity' in the symbolic sphere of language. Hence, the mother's body functions paradigmatically as the prototypical

'abject', (Kristeva, 1997). 'Abject' here entails a strong loathing, or aversion, accompanied by distancing from, or rejecting of something as 'other'. This implies an expulsion of it to the periphery of consciousness to keep it at arm's length, and, importantly, to attain a sense of self-with-boundaries. There are many examples—apart from the mother's body, Kristeva mentions corpses, among other things, to get her point across:

> The corpse (or cadaver: *cadere*, to fall), that which has irremediably come a cropper, is cesspool, and death;…refuse and corpses *show me* what I permanently thrust aside in order to live…If dung signifies the other side of the border, the place where I am not and which permits me to be, the corpse, the most sickening of wastes, is a border that has encroached upon everything. (1997, p. 231)

One should note that 'abjection' as a process is therefore not synonymous with 'repression', which marks relegating something experienced as unbearable or traumatic to the unconscious. What is abject, by contrast, is not wholly unconscious—it is always ambiguously located in a quasi-unconscious, quasi-conscious limit-realm, from where it 'haunts' the subject as an 'other' which nevertheless co-constitutes its sense of selfhood. I therefore believe that one can draw an analogy between the 'abject' and *homo sacer* as 'bare life', given the latter's comparable ambiguity with regard to its insertion in society, somehow *between* the law, or sovereign power, and purely biological life.

Rancière (2006), in turn, emphasises that (modern) democracies that project the image of *equality* are never, nor can they ever truly be, societies in which people enjoy equality. The reason for this is that 'equality' functions as a kind of 'quasi-transcendental' principle in relation to democracy, in so far as it is both the condition of *possibility* of democracies (or perhaps of democratic constitutions), *and* the condition of their *impossibility*. The latter implies that while one could point to democracies and their constitutions, their functioning is never 'pure' or unproblematical; on the contrary, such functioning is always already 'ruined'. This is probably what Derrida (2005) had in mind when he said that democracy was always 'to come'. One manifestation of such 'impurity' of democracy, according to Rancière, is the fact that some people are always excluded from society, even if they putatively live 'in' those societies. Rancière believes that customary politics is the work of what he calls the 'police' (not in the usual sense), which, for him, instantiates any agency that divides the *polis* or polity according to the interests of those who have a 'part' in it. Rancière's own concern is for the part of ordinary people, or the *demos*—those 'with no part', who are simultaneously excluded from politics *and* immanent to it as its constant shadow, or 'other' (Rancière, 2010; see also Olivier, 2015; Tanke, 2011). It is not my purpose to elaborate further on Rancière's or Kristeva's relevance for the present theme of *homo sacer* in the context of the 'pandemic', but merely to point to similar insights on their part regarding the paradox of simultaneous inclusion and exclusion of certain people in and from society.

'BARE LIFE' AND CURRENT EVENTS

Returning to the issue of manifestations of *homo sacer*, or treating people as bare life under current 'pandemic' conditions globally, these are so numerous that it is impossible to do justice to their pervasiveness in alternative media—'alternative', because such manifestations are carefully (and conspicuously) removed from mainstream media outlets such as CNN, BBC, Sky News, Al Jazeera, France Today, and so on, except as denials in the face of accusations from critics (for more on this in the context of the mass deception people face today, see Chossudovsky, 2022; Kennedy, 2021; Olivier, 2022a; RylandMedia, 2021; and *The Exposé*, 2022a, 2022b, among many sources). It would be easier to negotiate this densely populated terrain if it were approached under different headings, including 'vaccinations' (in scare quotes because they are not really vaccines; Olivier, 2021b), and controlled economic collapse. To give a brief impression of what is at stake, here is a summary, by Michel Chossudovsky (2022), of what he addresses in his startling book on the worldwide COVID-19 crisis:

> 1. The RT-PCR test is meaningless (now confirmed by the WHO [World Health Organization] and the CDC [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention]). The entire data base of so-called "COVID confirmed cases" is totally invalid. These are the estimates which have been used to justify ALL the COVID-19 mandates since March 2020. The figures on COVID-19 related mortality are also invalid...These are the fake "estimates" used to justify the violation of fundamental human rights.
>
> 2. SARS-CoV-2 is "similar to seasonal influenza" according to the CDC and the WHO. It is not a killer virus…
>
> 3. The economic and social impacts of the lockdowns are devastating: bankruptcies, unemployment, poverty and despair. The COVID-19 mandates are destroying people's lives…
>
> 4. The COVID-19 mRNA vaccines have resulted in a worldwide upward trend in mortality and morbidity which is amply documented... A confidential report by Pfizer made public under Freedom of Information (FOI) confirms that the COVID-19 jab is a "killer vaccine".
>
> 5. Recorded and registered for EU/UK/USA – 61,654 COVID-19 injection-related deaths and 9,755,085 injuries reported as at 28 January 2022 (only a small percentage of deaths and injuries are reported and recorded).
>
> 6. Pfizer has a criminal record with the US Department of Justice… (p. 4)

This should alert readers to the fact that what one is dealing with here is no 'conspiracy theory'—a phrase only too readily used by the perpetrators of these 'crimes against humanity' to deflect attention from themselves—but something to be taken very seriously, lest one suddenly finds oneself hopelessly compromised at many levels. Then, homing in on the question of efficacy of the vaunted COVID-19 'vaccines', here is a telling excerpt from Robert Kennedy's book (note that all the claims in Kennedy's book are supported by extensive documentation):

> A recent peer-reviewed study in the high-gravitas Elsevier journal *Toxicology Reports* found that COVID-19 vaccines kill more people in each age group than they save. According to that study the 'best-case scenario' is five times the number of deaths attributable to each vaccination vs. those attributable to COVID-19 in the most vulnerable 65+ demographic. (2021, p. 184)

Kennedy goes into a lot of detail regarding the reported effects of the 'vaccines' in different countries and different states in the United States, and without exception it appears that, instead of saving people's lives against the virus, the 'vaccines' are killing people. This is actually the heading of an article in the independent, alternative newspaper, *The Epoch Times*, in the form of a rhetorical question: "The Covid shots are killing people?":

> While you only get at most six months' worth of protection from any given shot, each injection will cause damage for 15 months. If we continue with boosters, eventually, it's going to be impossible to ever clear out the spike protein.
>
> While the spike protein is the part of the virus chosen as the antigen, the part that triggers an immune response, it's also the part of the virus that causes the worst disease. The spike protein is responsible for COVID-19-related heart and vascular problems, and it has the same effect when produced by your own cells.
>
> It causes blood clots, myocarditis and pericarditis, strokes, heart attacks and neurological damage, just to name a few. As noted by [Dr] McCullough, the spike protein of this virus was genetically engineered to be more dangerous to humans than any previous coronavirus, and that is what the COVID shots are programming your cells to produce. (Mercola, 2022, paras. 22–24)

This thoroughly referenced article makes no bones about the lethal dangers of the COVID-19 'vaccines'. I quote from one more news source regarding this, before demonstrating how this relates to Agamben's thesis concerning *homo sacer* and 'bare life'. An equally well-documented article in the alternative British newspaper, *The Exposé* (2022a), informs one that:

> An investigation of official Government data has uncovered that fully vaccinated individuals are up to 3 times more likely to be infected with Covid-19, 2 times more likely to be hospitalised with Covid-19, and 3 times more likely to die of Covid-19 than unvaccinated individuals.
>
> The question is, why?
>
> One possibility is that as feared, the vaccinated are suffering Vaccine-Associated Enhanced Disease leading to conditions such as antibody-dependent enhancement, and cytokine storm. In effect, this means the Covid-19 injections cause a vaccinated person's immune system to go into overdrive when they come into contact with the virus, causing harm to the person and worsening disease.
>
> But it turns out this possibility could actually be reality. Because the latest round of confidential Pfizer documents published 1st April 22, confirm that both Pfizer and the FDA [Food and Drug Administration] knew Vaccine-Associated Enhanced Disease was a possible consequence of the

> mRNA Covid-19 injections, and they received evidence of it occurring, including several deaths, but swept it under the carpet and claimed 'no new safety issues have been raised'. (paras. 1-4)

Are reports like these (and there are many more; see Olivier, 2021a, 2022a in this regard) sufficient to be able to claim that we are witnessing an *actual* surge in the treatment of humans as 'bare life', with any protection afforded by extant laws or constitutions summarily suspended? Probably not by themselves, except that the evidence (*The Exposé,* 2022a) confirming that both Pfizer and the FDA were aware of 'Vaccine-Associated Enhanced Disease' and deaths having occurred among the injected could be construed as manifestation of (conscious, if not deliberate) 'bare life'-treatment of the gullible public by decisionmakers in these organisations. However, one would need to do more to demonstrate, with supporting evidence, that such legal or constitutional protection has been either suspended and removed, or simply ignored, or that other 'laws' or regulations have been established that overrule constitutional or legal protection against compulsory or 'mandated' injections with these dangerous chemicals (Olivier, 2021a, 2022a). At least the evidence that the COVID-19 'vaccines' have been responsible for thousands, if not millions of deaths (and many different kinds of injuries; see Saveusnow, 2022, for more than 1000 scientific studies confirming this) among their recipients is sufficiently overwhelming to make any denial on the part of their apologists futile, and disingenuous to boot. The question that arises is whether such lethality has been unforeseen, or a genuine pharmaceutical 'mistake'. Evidence suggests otherwise.

EVIDENCE OF DELIBERATE 'BARE LIFE' TREATMENT OF PEOPLE

Origin of the 'novel coronavirus'

When the advent of the 'novel coronavirus' (SARS-CoV-2) was first announced early in 2020, indications were allegedly that it had (probably) infected a human being at a so-called 'wet market' (where wild animals are sold) in Wuhan, China (Mercola & Cummins, 2021), the hypothesis being that the virus had jumped by 'zoonotic transfer' from a bat to an intermediary animal like a pangolin and then to a human. Yet by March of that year (Olivier 2021a; Walsh & Cotovio, 2020; Woodward, 2020), scientists were less sure of the provenance of the virus. It was not long before another possibility was aired—that the virus had been created in a virology laboratory in Wuhan, from where it spread to the outside world. In fact, although this was not generally known because the relevant paper was evidently censored and removed soon after its publication, in February 2020 a study confirming that the 'novel coronavirus' was manufactured in a Chinese laboratory was published by a Chinese researcher (Breggin & Breggin, 2021). As regards the rationale for its creation, in his exhaustively documented book on Fauci and Gates, Robert Kennedy writes:

> Five months before WHO declared a global pandemic, at a time when 99.999 percent of Americans had never heard the phrase 'gain-of-function,' key government officials were already

> planning strategies for suppressing public discussion of the potential that a coronavirus might have been deliberately manipulated to enhance its pathogenicity and transmissibility in humans. (2021, p. 772)

Regarding the question of the location of such 'gain-of-function' research, Dr Joseph Mercola—together with Robert Kennedy, probably the most determined and tenacious critic of the Biden administration in America, and reviled by Biden and the mainstream media for 'spreading disinformation' (while, ironically, substantiating his penetrating research with copious documentation)—comments on the 'lab-leak' hypothesis as follows:

> Despite an ongoing cover-up by Chinese and US government authorities, the biotech industry, Big Pharma, the military-industrial complex, and the mass media, there is growing scientific consensus that the COVID-19 virus was created and (*most likely accidentally*) leaked from a dual-use military/civilian lab in Wuhan, China. (Mercola & Cummins, 2021, p. 29)

This is not the most startling information regarding the emergence of the 'novel coronavirus', however. Dr Peter and Ginger Breggin (2021)—another brave duo of researchers who smelled a rat early in the sequence of 'pandemic' events—confronts one with the news that a paper on the gain-of-function research involving dangerous *SARS-CoV* pathogens at the Wuhan institute was already published in 2015 by Vineet D. Menachery et al. They also urge one to remember that '…gain-of-function refers to gaining more dangerous functions, such as lethality' (2021, p. 43). What is relevant for the present article is the fact that this collaborative research between American and Chinese scientists was funded by Dr Anthony Fauci's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) and other organisations of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), *and* that it was far from innocent. As the Breggins put it: 'The Chinese were working with us [Americans] to insert the deadly spike protein into the otherwise harmless coronavirus to enable it to penetrate human cells to cause a SARS-CoV pandemic' (2021, p. 42).

One may argue that the Breggins jumped the gun by implying that causing a pandemic was (probably) the goal of the virus-research in Wuhan—after all, the research project was justified as making the development of vaccines possible, among other things (Breggin & Breggin, 2021). However, when one reads the following, including a quotation from a research project description, one is inclined to agree with them:

> The research can be traced to an announcement by the University of North Carolina on September 9, 2013, about a $10-million award from NIH to a program led by Ralph Baric. The purpose was to study and manipulate 'highly pathogenic human respiratory and systemic viruses which cause acute and chronic life-threatening disease outcomes.' (Breggin & Breggin, 2021, p. 46)

However, even if it is difficult to prove intent here, minimally it is irrefutable that highly dangerous research of this kind, which involves the deliberate engendering of extremely dangerous, potentially lethal pathogens, unavoidably run the risk of accidentally—if not deliberately—releasing these pathogens from laboratories into social space. Arguably, *this*

presupposes that people inhabiting this social space are, or have been, reduced to 'bare life', without rights, and unprotected by the constitution or the laws governing social life under normal, 'civilised' conditions. Apropos of the development of 'vaccines' in preparation for an anticipated 'pandemic' caused by a novel pathogen, the Breggins give credence to the conclusion—that an *a priori* reduction of humans to 'bare life' must be assumed—where they remark, under 'New Information' on 'Vaccine Hazards':

> These vaccines were and remain too hazardous for human experimentation. Because of the great interest the globalists were showing in the mRNA vaccines, many researchers began animal research on them several decades ago. The conclusive results are straightforward: The vaccines are too deadly in animals to be given to humans, even experimentally. (Breggin & Breggin, 2021, p. 240)

This brings one to the next category of evidence.

Lethal vaccines

Robert Kennedy (2021) provides a thorough, well-documented account of the lengths that Dr Anthony Fauci and self-styled vaccine 'expert', Bill Gates, went to after the outbreak of COVID-19 in 2020 to discredit early medical treatment of patients ill with the disease. The treatment concerned involved Hydroxychloroquine and Ivermectin—both of which were found to be extremely effective against COVID-19 by doctors such as Pierre Kory, Joseph Mercola, and Peter McCullough. Referring to anti-Ivermectin propaganda in *The New York Times*—derogating Ivermectin as a 'horse dewormer'—Kennedy writes:

> Peter McCullough laughs at the propaganda: 'Ivermectin is a molecule that is miraculously effective against parasites and viral infections along multiple pathways and mechanisms of action. It's a molecule. It doesn't care if it's used in a horse, or a cow, or a human. The rules of physics and chemistry are the same across species.' (2021, p. 145)

Kennedy (2021) also quotes Kory and Mercola along similar lines, with the latter pointing out that the 'intent' on the part of the so-called 'health agencies' is crystal clear, namely, to sow confusion among members of the public, goading them into falsely believing that Ivermectin is a 'veterinary drug'. In this way, he reminds one, they are supporting the 'Big Pharma narrative that the only thing at your disposal is the COVID shot' (p. 145). The fact that Mercola explicitly mentions 'intent' corroborates my earlier observation, that *what one is witnessing in the course of the unfolding Covid saga—specifically regarding the promotion of so-called 'vaccines' as the 'magic bullet' (in preference to treatment with Ivermectin and Hydroxychloroquine)—is nothing less than the reduction of human beings to 'bare life', exposing them to potentially being killed without any recourse to protection by the law or constitution, that is, without any rights.* I realise that this is a very strong claim, in need of substantiating evidence, which is supplied below. First it should be noted, again confirming

my claim regarding the ultimate manifestation of 'bare life' treatment (pending supporting evidence), that:

> During the spring of 2020, Dr. Fauci and Bill Gates carpet-bombed the airwaves, bearishly predicting that a 'miraculous vaccine' would stop COVID transmission, prevent illness, end the pandemic, and release humanity from house arrest. Even vaccinology's most stalwart tub thumpers—true believers like Dr. Peter Hotez and Dr. Paul Offit—regarded those forecasts as far-fetched and foolhardy. After all, for decades…seemingly insurmountable impediments had thwarted every attempt to craft a coronavirus vaccine. (Kennedy, 2021, p. 157)

If evidence could confirm that these 'miraculous vaccines' are the exact opposite of a cure for COVID-19, namely, a means of committing genocide, or perhaps rather *democide*—'murder by government' (Roar, 2021)—on an unprecedented scale, then I believe we are in fact today witnessing the *ne plus ultra* of 'bare life' practices. (This does not even include all the means by which such democide is being committed, which is addressed below.) The evidence to this effect abounds, and grows daily. Robert Kennedy (2021) categorises it as follows:

First, there is the issue of 'leaky vaccines' (Kennedy, 2021)—the phenomenon of the much-hyped 'vaccines' found to be *not* effective for sterilising subjects against the virus. Kennedy refers to several vaccinologists and virologists who admitted this to be the case after 'vaccine' trials failed to achieve immunity in test subjects (including even Dr Fauci, who nevertheless pressed on regardless, promoting these injections).

Second, and even more problematical, 'vaccine' developers had to face the tendency of these injections to trigger 'pathogenic priming' or 'antibody-dependent enhancement' (ADE)—'an overstimulation of immune system response that can cause severe injuries and death when vaccinated individuals subsequently encounter the wild viruses' (Kennedy, 2021, p. 159). It is not as if those individuals promoting the 'vaccines' were not aware of this danger; Kennedy lists several, again including Dr Fauci, who openly admitted this peril. Nevertheless, to shield himself and 'vaccine' manufacturers (who enjoyed 'immunity from liability') from accusations concerning the risk posed by ADE, Fauci employed 'six strategies' to cover up any evidence of its occurrence in recipients of the 'vaccines':

- The first of these tactics (Kennedy, 2021) entailed abandoning the supposed 3-year clinical trials for the 'vaccines' after six months, and then offering them to the control group, without the comparative value of which the possible harms from pathogenic priming would be (cleverly) hidden in the 'vaccinated' group.
- Second, given his power of control, Dr Fauci declined repairing the (Voluntary) Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) in the United States, despite a 2010 study concluding that it registers less than 1% of vaccine injuries generally. More than 99% of the COVID-19 'vaccine' injuries, including deaths, therefore go undetected (Kennedy, 2021).

- Third, what Kennedy (2021) dubs Fauci's 'trump card', was to use all the power and influence at his disposal to persuade social media companies like Google and Facebook, as well as mainstream television networks such as CNN and *The New York Times*, to censor all reports of adverse events, including deaths, that could be ascribed to the injections concerned. Even science journals—which are dependent on income from Big Pharma—agreed not to publish papers outlining the flood of lethal and incapacitating consequences of the jabs, and so-called 'fact-checking' companies, funded by Big Pharma and Bill Gates, did their best to 'debunk' reports and studies of 'vaccine' injuries. Needless to point out, the result was—as Dr Robert Malone remarked—that most Americans (and people in other countries too) were blissfully unaware of the toll the 'vaccines' were taking. Moreover, this mainstream muzzling and surveillance also targeted medical doctors like Dr Malone to discredit them as well as patients who reported harms done to them by the injections.
- Fourth, under Dr Fauci's direction, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) discouraged autopsies in cases where people were suspected to have died from the 'vax'. Nevertheless, in September 2021, two experienced German pathologists performed autopsies on ten corpses of individuals who died after 'vaccination', concluding that five, and probably seven, of these deaths were caused by the jabs. They said that they had not seen such a high number of red blood cells in clumps—linked to thrombosis—in hundreds of thousands of pathological studies (Kennedy, 2021).
- Fifth, Fauci made sure that the people on crucial FDA and CDC committees were grant holders with the NIH, NIAID and Gates Foundation, to guarantee 'rubberstamping' (premature) approval of the (experimental) mRNA 'vaccines', minus thorough studies of possible harmful effects (Kennedy, 2021). The fact that these people were compromised through their financial interests vitiates the value of their votes of approval.
- Sixth, Kennedy (2021) points out that Fauci's intention to 'vaccinate' the entire American population was probably aimed at eliminating a 'control group'—the 'unvaccinated'—which would have cast 'vaccine' injuries and deaths in stark relief. As for malevolent intent—which is germane to the question of treating humans as 'bare life', with no protection by law or a constitution—the fact that Fauci reneged on his assurance, in 2015, that no child would be vaccinated against a parent's will, by furthering dictatorial types of pressure on the 'vaccine-hesitant' in an effort to reach full population 'vaccination'-saturation, speaks volumes.

Because Kennedy's book was published in November 2021, and by then only the Pfizer 'Comirnaty (Pfizer-BioNTech) vaccine' had been granted FDA approval, he focuses on the adverse effects of this product to outline 'the shocking data'. By October 6, 2021, 230 million doses of this 'vaccine' had been administered by health officials in the United States, despite the fact that, as Kennedy (2021) reminds one,

> The final summary of the Pfizer's six-month clinical trial data—the document that Pfizer submitted to FDA to win approval—revealed one key data point that should have killed that intervention forever. Far more people died in the vaccine group than in the placebo group during Pfizer's clinical trials. The fact that FDA nevertheless granted Pfizer full approval, and that the medical community embraced and prescribed this intervention for their patients, is eloquent testimony to the resilience of even the most deadly and inefficacious products, and the breathtaking power of the pharmaceutical industry and its government allies to control the narrative through captive regulators, compliant physicians, and media manipulation, and to overwhelm the fundamental common sense of much of humanity. (p. 168)

Kennedy (2021) provides the table summarising the mortality data from Pfizer's 6- month clinical trial, and draws attention to the 'mathematical chicanery' involved in the company's claim, that its 'vaccine' is 100% better than the placebo used during the trial, because during this time, two people in the approximately 22,000 person-strong placebo group, and one person in the (comparably sized) 'vaccine' group died of COVID-19. Technically speaking, this is correct, but as Kennedy laconically remarks (2021), '22,000 vaccines must be given to save a single life from COVID' (p. 169)—despite which most Americans would probably have understood this misleading statistic to mean that the 'vaccine' would prevent 100% of potential deaths. Notwithstanding the fact that virologists would grasp the implication of this, namely, that with a less than 1% 'absolute risk' reduction (Kennedy, 2021) this 'vaccine' could not significantly influence mortality rates, Fauci and Gates continued to praise its capacity to 'end the pandemic'.

> But the story gets even worse. As table S4 shows, this entire meager advantage of preventing a single COVID death in every 22,000 vaccinated individuals (1/22,000) is entirely cancelled out by a fivefold increase in excess fatal cardiac arrests and congestive heart failures in vaccinated individuals (5/22,000). Pfizer and its regulatory magician, Dr. Fauci, used smoke and mirrors to divert public attention from this all-important question of all-cause mortality. (Kennedy, 2021, p. 170)

'All-cause mortality', Kennedy (2021, p. 171) avers, should be the crucial measurement to determine the value of any medical treatment such as 'vaccination'; only this metric indicates whether the 'vaccinated' subsequently enjoy superior benefits compared to the 'unvaccinated'. Put differently, while a treatment may initially seem to have beneficial effects (in the short term), it may, in the course of time, prove to induce deaths from a variety of causes, and therefore undermine the ostensible short-term benefits. Evidence—provided by Kennedy (2021)—shows that this has indeed been the case with the Pfizer 'vaccine'.

It is impossible to do justice to everything that Kennedy covers in the form of evidence demonstrating the lethal and otherwise injurious consequences of the Pfizer jab. I restrict myself to the most significant instances of this. It is important to note, to begin with, that the deaths in the clinical trial vaccine group exceeded the control group by 42.8%—something that Pfizer tried to hide by omitting five deaths from Table S4 and only entering them in the fine print of their report. The shocking results of the trial should have led to the rejection of

this vaccine, but compromised FDA officials, together with the complicit mainstream and social media, the inadequate VAERS system, and the CDC's practice of obscuring the real consequences of the jab, effectively covered up the evidence that 'vaccinated Americans began dying in droves' (Kennedy, 2021, p. 172). In fact:

> By August 2021, Dr. Fauci, the CDC, and White House officials were reluctantly conceding that vaccination would neither stop illness nor transmission, but nevertheless, they told Americans that the jab would, in any case, protect them against severe forms of the disease or death. (It's worth mentioning that HCQ [hydroxychloroquine] and ivermectin could have accomplished this same objective at a tiny fraction of its price.) Dr. Fauci and President Biden, presumably with Dr. Fauci's prompting, told Americans that 98 percent of serious cases, hospitalizations, and deaths were among the unvaccinated. This was a lie. Real-world data from nations with high COVID jab rates show the complete converse of this narrative; the resumption of infections in all those countries accompanied an explosion of hospitalizations, severe cases and deaths **among the vaccinated!** Mortalities across the globe, in fact, have tracked Pfizer's deadly clinical trial results, with the vaccinated dying in higher numbers than the non-vaccinated. These data cemented suspicions that the feared phenomenon of pathogenic priming has arrived, and is now wreaking havoc. (Kennedy, 2021, pp. 176–177; bold in original)

I should stress, once again, that these statements on Kennedy's part are substantiated by extraordinarily thorough documentation. This is the case, for example, regarding the rates of infection and death in other (highly 'vaccinated') countries, of which he pays particular attention to Gibraltar—the most 'vaccinated' nation globally, where the death rate increased 19-fold after everyone was fully jabbed. Similarly, abject results could be observed in Malta, Iceland, Belgium, Singapore, Britain, and Israel (the chief global promoter of the Pfizer vaccine), with Kennedy (2021) commenting on 'vaccination' numbers and health officials' disappointment at dismal infection and mortality rates where relevant.

The evidence adduced by Kennedy regarding the death toll (and other injuries) attributable to the Pfizer 'vaccine' in the USA and other countries, as well as his reconstruction of evidence irresistibly pointing at full awareness of the lethality of this medical intervention on the part of people like Fauci, Gates, and too many other implicated individuals to list here (see Breggin & Breggin, 2021; Kennedy, 2021; Mercola & Cummins, 2021) makes it impossible to avoid a shocking conclusion: that the people suffering these deadly consequences have been, and still are regarded (with the rest of humanity), by these culprits, as 'bare life', with no rights. Other researchers have adduced similar research results, including Prof. Michel Chossudovsky (2022), Dr Mercola and Ronnie Cummins (2021; see also Mercola, 2022), and the husband and wife team of Dr Peter and Ginger Breggin (2021; where they focus on both mRNA and DNA-based vaccines), to mention only some among many (for more information on this, see Olivier 2021a, 2022a, 2022b).

CONCLUSION

To conclude this article, one should take note of the warnings from courageous people, years before the 'pandemic' was announced. One of these brave people is Jane Bürgermeister, a former WHO-employee-turned-activist (Wilson, 2022), who warned the world in 2010 about the sinister plans being forged by this organisation, which is *supposed* to promote the health of the world's people. Rhoda Wilson comments as follows on the interview with Bürgermeister, titled 'Forced vax warning—February 15, 2010':

> **Prescient Testimony**:
>
> A former WHO staffer, Jane Bürgermeister, shared frighteningly prescient testimony in 2010. Her understanding was that respiratory virus pandemics will be used to force **near-universal vaccination** and that this had sinister motives. I dismissed this the first time I saw it. Many of us turn away instinctively from evil because we cannot or do not want to believe that other humans are capable of that which our logic tells us is happening. I now no longer reject it. (2022, para. 6; bold in original)

I strongly encourage readers to listen to the interview with Bürgermeister (where she already refers to the 'new world order'), which is accessible on the site where Wilson introduces 'Covid lies: Prescient testimonies' (Wilson, 2022).

In an upcoming second article, attention is given to other aspects of the cabal's attempt to destroy extant society, namely 'engineered economic collapse', 'chemtrails', and 'what (to expect) next'. There it is argued that these practices take the notion of *homo sacer*, 'bare life', and its concomitant biopolitical and pharma-political practices to unprecedented, virtually incomprehensible levels of depravity, and that a certain 'Platonic' psychotherapy, complemented by its Kristevan counterpart, is called for.

REFERENCES

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer. Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press.

Agamben, G. (2020, March 17). Clarifications. (A. Kotsko, Trans.) *An und für sich* [In and of itself]. https://itself.blog/2020/03/17/giorgio-agamben-clarifications/

Arendt, H. (1998). *The human condition* (2nd ed). The University of Chicago Press.

Aristotle. (n.d.). Politics (B. Jowett, Trans.). In W.D. Ross (Ed.), *Aristotle – works* (pp. 2788–3049). https://www.holybooks.com/wp-content/uploads/The-Complete-Aristotle.pdf

Bratton, B. (2021, 28 July). Agamben WTF, or how philosophy failed the pandemic. *Verso*. https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/5125-agamben-wtf-or-how-philosophy-failed-the-pandemic

Breggin, P.R., & Breggin, G.R. (2021). *COVID-19 and the global predators: We are the prey*. Lake Edge Press.

Chossudovsky, M. (2022). *The 2020-22 worldwide corona crisis destroying civil society, engineered economic depression, global coup d'état and the "great reset".* https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-2020-worldwide-corona-crisis-destroying-civil-society-engineered-economic-depression-global-coup-detat-and-the-great-reset/5730652?pdf=5730652

Debord, G. (n.d.). *Society of the spectacle* (K. Knabb, Trans.). Rebel Press.

Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. *October, 59*, 3–7. https://www.jstor.org/stable/778828

Derrida, J. (2005). *Rogues: Two essays on reason*. Stanford University Press.

Duncan, J. (2013). South African journalism and the Marikana massacre: A case study of an editorial failure. *The Political Economy of Communication, 1*(2). https://www.polecom.org/index.php/polecom/article/view/22/198

Foucault, M. (1980). *The history of sexuality. Vol. 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans). Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1988). *The care of the self. The history of sexuality, Vol. 3* (R. Hurley, Trans). Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1992). *The use of pleasure. The history of sexuality, Vol. 2* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish. The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books.

Kennedy, R. F. (Jr). (2021). *The Real Anthony Fauci. Bill Gates, Big Pharma and the Global War on Democracy and Public Health*. Skyhorse Publishing.

Kristeva, J. (1997). *The portable Kristeva* (K. Oliver, Ed.). Columbia University Press.

Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, *15*(1), 11–40.

McAfee, N. (2004). *Julia Kristeva*. Routledge.

Mercola, J., & Cummins, R. (2021). *The truth about COVID-19: Exposing the great reset, lockdowns, vaccine passports, and the new normal*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Mercola, J. (2022, 18 April). The COVID shots are killing people? *The Epoch Times*. https://www.theepochtimes.com/the-covid-shots-are-killing-people_4411307.html

Olivier, B. (2007). Nature as 'abject', critical psychology, and 'revolt': The pertinence of Kristeva. *South African Journal of Psychology, 37*(3), 443–469.

Olivier, B. (2010). Foucault and individual autonomy. *South African Journal of Psychology, 40*(3), 292–307.

Olivier, B. (2015). Ranciére and the recuperation of politics. *Phronimon* (Journal of the South African Society for Greek Philosophy and the Humanities), *16*(1), 1–15. http://www.phronimon.co.za/index.php/phroni/article/view/102/112

Olivier, B. (2018). The poverty of (critical) theory. *Acta Academica, 50*(2), 1–39. http://dx.doi. org/10.18820/24150479/ aa50i3.00

Olivier, B. (2019). Religious authoritarianism and/or 'instrumentarian' technical surveillance: The Handmaid's Tale and 1984. *Alternation* (Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of the

Arts and Humanities in Southern Africa), *Special Edition 28*, 10–37. http://alternation.ukzn.ac.za/Files/articles/special-editions/28/02-Olivier-F.pdf

Olivier, B. (2021a). The 'pandemic' and the differend. *Phronimon* (Journal of the South African Society for Greek Philosophy and the Humanities), *22*, 1–35. https://upjournals.co.za/index.php/Phronimon/article/view/9764/5124

Olivier, B. (2021b, May 31). 'Is the push for the vaccine a push too far?' *Thought Leader*. https://thoughtleader.co.za/is-the-push-for-the-vaccine-a-push-too-far/

Olivier, B. (2022a). Massive deception masquerading as information and communication: A (largely) Derridean perspective. *Phronimon* (Journal of the South African Society for Greek Philosophy and the Humanities), *23*, 1–31. https://doi.org/10.25159/2413-3086/10811

Olivier, B. (2022b). Therapeutic reflections on the 'pandemic'. *Psychotherapy and Politics International, 20*(1&2), 1–29. https://ojs.aut.ac.nz/psychotherapy-politics-international/article/view/21

Rancière, J. (2006). *Hatred of democracy* (S. Corcoran, Trans.). Verso.

Rancière, J. (2010). *Dissensus. On politics and aesthetics* (S. Corcoran, Trans.). Continuum.

Roar, B. (2021, November 22). Democide…what is it? Is it happening globally right now? *Thrivalinternational*. https://thrival.international/2021/11/22/democide-what-is-it-is-it-happening-globally-right-now/

RylandMedia. (2021, November 23). *Iconoclast one to one Melissa Cuimmei: They want your children!* [Video]. BitChute. https://www.bitchute.com/video/A1i3YtzVzKXf/

Saveusnow. (2022, January 5). *Covid Vaccine Scientific Proof Lethal.* http://www.saveusnow.org.uk/covid-vaccine-scientific-proof-lethal

Stiegler, B. (2016). *Automatic society. Volume 1. The future of work* (D. Ross, Trans.). Polity Press.

Tanke, J. J. (2011). *Jacques Rancière: An introduction.* Continuum.

The Exposé. (2022a, April 3). Official government data suggests the fully vaccinated are suffering antibody-dependent enhancement; and the newly published Pfizer documents prove Pfizer & the FDA knew it would happen. https://dailyexpose.uk/2022/04/03/confidential-pfizer-docs-official-gov-data-vaccinated-suffering-ade/

The Exposé. (2022b, April 12). Whilst you were distracted by Boris's trip to Kyiv, the UK Gov quietly published data confirming the fully vaccinated accounted for 92% of all Covid-19 deaths in March. https://expose-news.com/2022/04/12/distracted-boris-kyiv-fully-vaccinated-92-percent-covid-deaths/

Walsh, N. P., & Cotovio, V. (2020, March 20). *Bats Are not to Blame for Coronavirus. Humans Are*. CNN Health. https://edition.cnn.com/2020/03/19/health/coronavirus-human-actions-intl/index.html

Wilson, R. (2022, May 30). Covid lies: Prescient testimonies. *The Exposé.* https://expose-news.com/2022/05/30/covid-lies-prescient-testimonies/

Woodward, A. (2020, May 29). The Chinese CDC now says the coronavirus didn't jump to people at the Wuhan wet market—instead, it was the site of a super-spreader event. *Yahoo News*. https://uk.news.yahoo.com/chinese-cdc-now-says-coronavirus-224900090.html.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power.* Public Affairs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the University of the Free State and the National Research Foundation of South Africa for funding that made the research possible which has resulted in the present article being published. There are no conflicts of interest to declare.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Bert Olivier is an Honorary Professor of Philosophy at the University of the Free State, South Africa. He has published academic articles and books across a wide variety of disciplines, including philosophy, art theory, architecture, literature, psychoanalytic theory, cinema, communication studies, and social theory. Bert received the South African Stals Prize for Philosophy in 2004, and a Distinguished Professorship from Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in 2012.